REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Examiner is thanked for her thorough search and her indication that Claims 2-3, 5-8, 11, 12, 14-15, and 17-18 contain allowable subject matter. In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of Claims 1, 4, 10, 13, and 19-20 is respectfully requested. Claims 1, 4, 10, and 13 have been amended to more distinctly claim the invention. Claims 2, 5, 8, 11, 13, 14, and 17 have been amended to correct minor typographical errors. In a previous response, Claims 7 and 16 were canceled. No additional claims have been added. Thus, Claims 1-6, 8-15, and 17-20 are currently pending in the application

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1,4, 10, 13 and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,753) in view of Mueller et al. (U.S. 6,584,612 B1). That rejection is respectfully traversed.

It is respectfully submitted that amended Claims 1 and 10 are patentable over the applied references.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

> (Currently Amended) A computer-implemented method for accessing an instance of a recreatable object in a shorter-duration memory based on a reference to the instance of the recreatable object located in a longer-duration memory, wherein the shorter-duration memory is associated with a call, the method comprising the steps of:
> locating, within the shorter-duration memory, a context structure, wherein at least a portion of the context structure is passed as an argument to the call;
> locating an XREF pointers array based on data cached within the context structure, wherein the data cached within the context structure includes a reference to the XREF pointer array;
> determining whether the XREF pointers array includes a pointer associated with said reference to the instance of the recreatable object; and

if the XREF pointers array includes a pointer associated with said reference to the instance of the recreatable object, then following said pointer to locate said instance within said shorter-duration memory.

Such a method is neither taught nor suggested by Chang or Mueller, either alone or in an alleged combination. For example, at the very least, neither Chang nor Mueller teaches "locating, within the shorter-duration memory, a context structure, wherein at least a portion of the context structure is passed as an argument to the call." Instead, Chang describes a mechanism for persistently maintaining an object reference without increasing the amount of memory used by the process calling the object reference. (See Chang, Col. 3, lines 18-23; Col., 5, lines 1-6; and Col. 5, lines 35-37)).

To persistently maintain an object, Chang offloads information from memory to "persistent storage." (See Chang, Col. 5, lines 13-17 and Col. 5, lines 30-34). The Chang objects are allowed to persist because of the following:

A "server process maintains a reference data table in memory 90, along with a reference data table in persistent storage 92, such as a file or a relational database. The reference data table in memory 90, contains for each persistent object managed by the server, a key 78, a pointer 77 to the memory location 72, containing the object, and the metastate 71 for the object. The reference data table in persistent storage 92, contains the key 78, and the metastate 71, for each persistent object. Each persistent object in memory 72, contains the metastate 71, required to save/restore the objects state persistently, using whatever mechanism the object deems appropriate." (See Chang, Col. 5, lines 36-49).

In other words, Chang requires at least two reference tables to accurately maintain a persistent object: a reference table in memory and a reference table in persistent storage. Since Chang maintains two reference tables, one in memory and one in persistent storage, there is no need for it to pass at least a portion of a context structure as an argument to the call. Moreover, Chang does not suggest passing any information from the reference table to a call. Hence, Chang does not teach at least the first element of Claim 1.

Applicants have carefully reviewed Mueller and cannot find a teaching of "locating, within the shorter-duration memory, a context structure, wherein at least a portion of the context structure is passed as an argument to the call." Moreover, the Office Action has not asserted that Mueller teaches or suggests this limitation. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that since at least the first element of Claim 1 is not taught or suggested by Chang or Mueller, neither individually nor in an alleged combination, the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejection of Claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 4 and 19 depend from Claim 1, and thus include each and every feature of Claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 4 and 19 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claim1.

Claims 10, 13, and 20 contain features that are computer-readable medium claims reasonably analogous to the claims described above in connection with Claim 1. Therefore, based on at least the reasons stated above with respect to Claim 1, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 10, 13, and 20 are allowable over the art of record and are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Brian D. Hickman
Reg. No. 35,894

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, CA 95110
(408) 414-1080
Date: 1/5/06
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 1/5/06 by Judy Paradoski